REMARKS

This amendment is submitted simultaneously with a Request for Continued Examination and is in response to the Final Rejection of the pending claims in the Office Action of October 3, 2005.

Claims 1 through 35 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 6, 8, 19, and 26 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and particularly in paragraphs [0072] through [0075]. No new matter has been entered to the disclosure as the amendment clearly complies with 35 U.S.C. § 132. The amendments are to clearly distinguish the invention over the cited art. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on Grasso *et al.* (U.S. Publication 2002/0116291)

Claims 1 through 7 and 19 through 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Grasso *et al.* (U.S. Publication 2002/0116291) (hereinafter "Grasso").

Applicants assert that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Regarding presently amended independent claim 1, Applicants asserts that Grasso does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 1 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants assert that Grasso does not describe the elements of the claimed invention calling for "supplying from a second server, comprising a printing apparatus with an embedded web server, a different at least one generic access instruction operable for providing a print dialog box with selectable options for printing said data with the printing apparatus." Therefore, for at least these reasons, Grasso does not anticipate presently amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 through 7 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 1.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 19, Applicants asserts that Grasso does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 19 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants assert that Grasso does not describe the elements of the claimed invention calling for "a printer with an embedded web server", and "at least one other generic access instruction configured to generate a print dialog box including a print preview option for the data." Therefore, for at least these reasons, Grasso does not anticipate presently amended claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 20 through 25 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 19.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 26, Applicants asserts that Grasso does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 26 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants assert that Grasso does not describe the elements of the claimed invention calling for "a second generic access instruction configured for causing display of a print dialog box with a plurality of selectable options", and "a second server comprising a printing device including a web server and operable for communicating the web content." Therefore, for at least these reasons, Grasso does not anticipate presently amended claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 26 is allowable.

Claims 27 through 35 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 26.

<u>Obviousness Rejection Based on Grasso in view of Croy (U.S. Publication 2001/0047384 A1)</u>

Claims 8 through 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grasso in view of Croy (U.S. Publication 2001/0047384 A1) (hereinafter "Croy"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

8

Applicants assert that Grasso and Croy, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of presently amended independent claim 8 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness regarding the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants assert that Grasso and Croy do not teach or suggest the claim limitations of the claimed invention calling for "communicating a second web content from a printer incorporating a web server to said client providing capability for outputting said data, the capability for outputting said data comprising a print dialog box including at least one selectable option." Therefore, for at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has not been established because any combination of the cited art cannot and does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the claimed invention. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 9 through 18 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 8.

Applicants submit that claims 1 through 35 are clearly allowable over the cited art.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 1 through 35 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,

James R. Duzan

James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT, P.C.
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: February 3, 2006
JRD/dlm:lmh

Document in ProLaw